Science Advisory Committee Meeting at Mather Training Center

Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Resources Workgroup

Notes from 11/19/02

Participants: Kent Schwarzkopf (NPS – APPA), Doug Samson (TNC – MD), Marcus Koenen (NPS – NCR), Diane Pavek (NPS – NCR), Dianne Ingram (NPS – CHOH), Brent Steury (NPS – NACE) and Christina Wright (NPS – NCR)

Purpose Statement

To prioritize ranked species (state, federal, global) and identify specific threats to these species in such a way that allows us to meet the short- and long-term goals to sustain biodiversity within NCR.

Expected Outcomes:

1. Revised Action Plan and Time Table
2. Review major points from July Scoping meeting
      Follow up actions – Where are we? What changes are needed?

Handouts included GIS maps indicating locations of all species from heritage data meeting RTE Criteria 1 – 4.

Discussion:

It was noted that we are still waiting for heritage data regarding rare communities. We may not get it anytime soon.

It was also noted that the list of RTE species received from heritage was lacking site names. Chris said that she would look into it and try to get that information from heritage. In addition, Kent and Doug noted that there have been more recent inventories. APPA, for example, had additional data that is not reflected on the GIS maps.

The group discussed the need to get peer review of the heritage data. We identified the following columns should be reviewed by experts: names (scientific and common), state, county, all ranks, last observed, date of last survey, eo data, gendescription, eo code, site name, and precision. The table would be grouped by site name to make it easier for experts to review the table. In addition, the list would need to be reviewed by Park staff to add additional species they may know about. It was noted, for example, that Hay's Amphipod was not on the GIS map. The purpose of this peer review would be to 1. Add/subtract species and 2.

Action Items

After some discussion and clarification on the process described above, the group decided to approach the problem another way:

Step 1. Get site names from heritage for species list. (Lead: Chris/Marcus)

Step 2. Combine the species list with the already park reviewed species list. (Lead: Chris/Marcus)

Step 3. Use the combined information from steps 1 and 2 to identify preliminary sites based on:
     - areas that have high diversity
     - sites that have large populations and a significant threat
     - other sites deemed important and have a significant threat
     (Lead: Marcus and Doug working independently)

Step 4. Review, refine, and prioritize the proposed sites during a 17th January RTE Meeting at Mather 10 am.

Step 5. Share priority sites to be monitored with park staff and expert review.

Step 6. Identify monitoring protocols.